



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROCK HILL DIVISION**

SHAHID L.A. MAJID, <i>aka Arthur Moseley</i> ,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	
	§	CIVIL ACTION 0:19-1793-MGL-PJG
RN Richards; RN Belser; Ms. Barbara, <i>Kitchen</i>	§	
<i>Supervisor</i> ; Cpt. Carter; Karol Berry, <i>Health</i>	§	
<i>Service Headquarters</i> ; Mr. Woodham, <i>Kitchen</i>	§	
<i>Supervisor</i> ; Sgt. Summers; RN Ms. Heather	§	
Varnadore; Lt. C. Parker, <i>all in their individual</i>	§	
<i>capacities</i> ; SCDC;	§	
Defendants.	§	

**AMENDED ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION,
GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT,
DENYING PLAINTIFFS' MOTIONS FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION,
AND DISMISSING WITHOUT PREJUDICE
THE CLAIMS AGAINST DEFENDANT RICHARDS**

Plaintiff Shahid L.A. Majid (Majid) filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 lawsuit pro se. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting Defendants' motions for summary judgment be granted, Majid's motions for a preliminary injunction be denied, and the claims against Defendant Richards be dismissed without prejudice. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court.

Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on September 25, 2020, but Majid failed to file any objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court Defendants’ motions for summary judgment are **GRANTED**, Majid’s motions for a preliminary injunction are **DENIED**, and the claims against Defendant Richards are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 19th day of October, 2020, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.